

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
November 1, 2021**

A Regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Canton was held by video teleconference (Zoom) in accordance with Michigan law on Monday, November 1, 2021. Chairman Greene called the meeting to order at 7:07 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Engel, Eggenberger, Weber, Acharya, Okon, Greene.

Each member noted that they were video teleconferencing from Canton Township, Wayne County, Michigan, with the exception of Commissioner Eggenberger Northbrook Illinois.

Absent: Foster, Singh, Zuber

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 4TH, 2021

Motion by Weber, supported by Eggenberger, to move to approve the minutes from October 4, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 6-0

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Weber, supported by Engel, to move to accept the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 057-SLU-6966 **DOGOLOGY UNIVERSITY** – Consider Special Land Use on parcel no. 057-01-0013-301 (44125 Ford Rd.). Property is located south of Ford Road between Sheldon Road and Morton Taylor Road. Proposed expansion of indoor pet boarding and training facility establishment.

Mr. Sloan explained the Commission has looked at this project a couple of times. The first time was for a Special Land Use for the building itself. During that review, it was discovered that the southern 10 feet of the building were in the OSP (Off-Street Parking) zoning district. The Planning Commission also held a Public Hearing to rezone the southern 10 feet of the building from OSP to C-2 as well as an additional 30 feet south which includes the parking just south of the building. The reason for that proposed rezoning to C-2 is, first, to allow the southern 10 feet of the building to be used for indoor training and boarding facility, and for an outdoor bathroom area for dogs. There is a proposal in the plans this evening that would remove about four (4) parking spaces and enclose those spaces with a high opaque fence that would open directly to the southern door. For the applicant to be eligible to make the application for an expansion of the Special Land Use, they applied for the rezoning and that was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, and the Township Board held the first reading of that rezoning and unanimously approved the first reading. The second reading of the rezoning will be next Tuesday (November 9th). Planning Staff anticipates approval of the C-2 rezoning of the southern 10 feet of the building and 30 feet south of the building.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation for the special land use is approval of the proposed SLU and approval of the proposed site plan changes for the expansion of the indoor pet boarding and training facility

subject to the following conditions: (1) that the Township Board approves the Second Reading of the rezoning application of C-2 for the subject area; and (2) that the site maintains the standards of the previously approved site plans with the exception of the approved exterior changes and meets the noise standards of Section 7.02(A) of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Sloan added that the previous site plan included the parking layout, the drive south of the building. That will not change except for the removal of about four spaces. The landscape, pond area, lighting, and dumpster area will remain the same on the proposed plans.

Motion by Engel, supported by Weber, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously those present by roll call vote, 6-0 (7:15 pm)

The representative for the project was not present for comment. There were no comments from the audience.

Chairman Greene stated they have dealt with this project several times now, so it really isn't an issue that there is not a representative present tonight. Chairman Greene said it is his understanding that they are just doing a little tidying up of the property boundary in terms of zoning, and it is contingent on the Board following through with the complete approval of the one change to the zoning.

Mr. Sloan said that is correct, especially as it relates to using the entire floor area of the building and having it zoned properly, which is something the applicant wants to do. The only exterior change proposed in the special land use is to have what they call an outdoor break area (measuring 17' deep by 48' wide). The break area is a 6' vinyl fenced-in area and the yard is proposed to have sand, so it's a break area where dogs can go to the bathroom and it can be easily cleaned up through the sand.

Commissioner Eggenberger stated she does not have any questions and does not see an issue with the applicant not being in attendance.

Mr. Sloan said one person from the audience is requesting to speak.

Mr. Lorenzo Toya and Heather Toya, 2046 Brookline Street. Mr. Toya stated they share the southern border of this property. They have two dogs and there is a chain-link fence in place. They are just concerned about the opacity in between the space. The grass on the other side of their fence is currently being used, but it sounds like this won't go on forever if they get the outdoor space in place. There are no sidewalks so it is not too much concern, but they are walking dogs up and down the street to where the sidewalk ends and that does introduce strange dogs regularly, which causes some dismay among their pets and their baby who shares the northern wall closest to the property. They are concerned about the grass and the opacity between the two properties, which sounds like that may have been settled already.

Motion by Okon, supported by Eggenberger, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 6-0. (7:20 pm)

Commissioner Weber wanted to address the neighbor's concern. The grassy area the resident is referring to will remain grass because it's going to be a retention area, is that correct?

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct.

Commissioner Weber asked that there is no intent for this area to be used for the dogs.

Mr. Sloan stated no, not that he is aware of. The fenced-in area just south of the building is the area they are proposing for the six-foot high vinyl opaque fence, where the dogs will access directly from the building

outdoors into the fenced-in area.

Commissioner Weber stated he just wanted to put the neighbor's mind at ease that there will not be dogs out playing in the yard right adjacent to their property.

Mr. Sloan explained the definition of an indoor pet boarding and training facility doesn't allow for outdoor runs and exercise areas. This would be exclusive for a break yard to use the bathroom, but wouldn't be able to use it as an exercise area or run.

Chairman Greene stated the only concern he has is not so much from the use of the facility, but the facility's clients. As a dog owner himself, he can see where somebody might come into the lot, take the dog out of the car and then decide to let them go to the bathroom before going into the facility and walk to the pond area. Is there a way to stop that?

Mr. Sloan said he does not think there is a way to control that.

Chairman Greene stated another concern is, regarding the parking. Is there the possibility that the parking on Brookline becomes an issue because people don't even go into a lot with their car but just park on Brookline to take their dog from the car to the facility, causing congestion on Brookline?

Mr. Sloan stated that could be a possibility. There is a row of parking along the west side of Brookline that's perpendicular to the road itself, so Brookline serves not just as the road but as the parking aisle. Mr. Sloan believes that parking is in the road right-of-way and is intended to serve the buildings to the west, but people going to Dogology won't know that unless these parking spaces were marked.

Chairman Greene stated that this may be a signage issue.

Mr. Sloan stated that if there is an issue with signage, Staff can work with the Police Department on that.

Chairman Greene had one last question. At the southern end of the parking lot, there is no berming or a wall of any sort. How late is this facility slated to be open? Chairman Greene is concerned about headlights that could face south into the neighbor's yard. That would be an annoyance.

Mr. Sloan stated the hours of operation weren't prescribed as conditions of approval with the special land use. When the facility went through site plan review a few years ago and they expanded the parking lot to the south, the parking was sized for a retail facility at that Magformers building, and that didn't have restrictions on hours of operation. They had to plant a dense row of evergreens on that south side of the property to screen for that purpose. That row of evergreens is still there, and one of the conditions is that the site has to maintain the previous landscape plan. If for some reason any shrubs or trees die, they would have to be replaced according to the approved site plan.

There were no further comments from the Commission members.

Motion by Engel, supported by Weber, to move to recommend approval of the expansion of the special land use for an indoor pet boarding and training facility use on parcel no. 71-057-01-0013-301 at 44125 Ford Rd. as the request meets the Special Land Use criteria of the Canton Township Zoning Ordinance pursuant to the information and plans provided, subject to the following conditions: (1) that the Township Board approves the Second Reading of the rezoning application of C-2 for the subject area; and (2) that the site maintains the standards of the previously approved site plans with the exception of the approved exterior changes and meets the noise standards of Section 7.02(A) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Okon called the vote:

Ayes: Engel, Eggenberger, Weber, Acharya, Okon, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 6-0. (7:33pm)

Chairman Greene said that this now goes to the Board of Trustees for its review and decision.

Mr. Sloan said that is correct.

2. 138-PDDF-6234 **CANTON MARKETPLACE & REDWOOD AT MARKETPLACE** – Consider Final PDD on parcel nos. 103-99-0001-003, 133-99-0001-001, 133-99-0001-002, 133-99-0001-003, 133-99-0002-000 (3700 Morton Taylor), 133-99-0004-000 (43600 Michigan Ave.), 133-99-0006-000, 133-99-0007-000, 133-99-0008-000 (43780 Michigan Ave.), 133-99-0009-000 (43800 Michigan Ave.), 133-99-0010-000 (43820 Michigan Ave.), and 138-99-0004-000. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue between Sheldon Road and Lilley Road. Proposed commercial and residential PDD.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant is proposing to construct a mixed use Planned Development (PD) District for 235 single-story apartments on 48 acres (4.9 units per acre) and up to 77,940 square feet of commercial on 14.37 acres on the north side Michigan Avenue and along both sides of Morton Taylor Rd. The residential portion of the development includes two (2) phases: Phase 1 includes the residential development west of Morton Taylor Rd., paving Morton Taylor-Road to the north line of Phase 1, and construction of the storm water pond that serves residential and future commercial area in Phases on that side of Morton-Taylor Rd.; Phase 2 includes the residential development east of Morton Taylor Rd., paving of Morton-Taylor Rd. to the north end of their property to where the Rouge trailhead starts, and construction of the storm water pond that serves residential and future commercial area in those Phases to the south.

This project goes back roughly 1.5 years with the planned development. The Preliminary Planned Development was approved by the Township Board of Trustees on July 28, 2020, which was previously recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on July 13, 2020. That was in the middle of COVID times when the Commission was meeting at The Village Theatre. Shortly thereafter, the applicant had filed for a final planned development and site plan review, and it has taken a while to get to the point of having a Public Hearing on the final planned development. There have been some access management items that have been worked out with the applicant and also with MDOT. There has also been some environmental work in terms of finding the boundaries of the wetlands and trying to finalize the site layout based on those conditions. Mr. Sloan stated this has been a little bit longer of a process just because of the size and complexity of the project. Now we are at the point of having the Public Hearing on the final planned development. The Final PD plan retains the same number of residential units and commercial floor area and the same phasing that was approved at the preliminary PD plan. However, the following major changes to the plans have been made since Preliminary PD approval:

- **Removal of Access Points from Michigan Ave.** In addition to the access from Morton Taylor Rd., the Preliminary PD plan included 3 curb cuts from Michigan Ave. west of Morton Taylor Rd. and 2 curb cuts from Michigan Ave. east of Morton Taylor Rd. The Final PD plan removes 1 of these curb cuts west of Morton Taylor Rd. and 1 of these curb cuts east of Morton Taylor Rd.
- **Additional sidewalks in the residential areas.** The Preliminary PD plan included sidewalks on only 1 side of the residential streets. The Final PD plan includes sidewalks on both sides of the residential streets.

- **Increased open space and wetland preservation.** The Preliminary PD plan included 26.1 acres of open space, and the Final PD plan includes 2 additional acres of open space. Additionally, the Preliminary PD plan included 1.759 acres of regulated wetlands preserved, and the Final PD plan includes 3.459 acres of regulated wetlands, so there is more wetland on the final PD plan.

As a result of increasing the amount of sidewalk, that pushes some of those buildings back in order to preserve those front-yard setbacks and driveways to keep the driveways still long enough to park cars. By adding 5 ft. sidewalks, a lot of those units have been pushed back an additional 5 feet. That has resulted in some tighter configurations, and one of the challenges is trying to expand the sidewalk and still maintain the natural features preservation which the plan does. As a result, some of the units have gotten tighter, mostly the rear-to-rear separation and some of the side rear separations.

Every Planned Development District is required to demonstrate definite benefits to the community according to the Ordinance. The most significant definite benefits are:

- Preserving 26.1 acres of open space
- Preservation of regulated wetlands and densely-wooded areas
- Installing a sidewalk network that will allow pedestrian access throughout the development, including between residential areas, commercial uses, and the Lower Rouge Trail which is northwest of the site
- Paving of Morton Taylor Road adjacent to the site.

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan classified the area as Mixed Use. According to the Comprehensive Plan, the current zoning districts of C-3 and R-6 are recommended on the north side of Michigan Ave. in this area of the Township, provided that the R-6-zoned area is not exclusive and is part of a mixed-use development. This is why having the sidewalk connections between the residential portion and the commercial portion is so important.

Land Uses. Before the planned development application was submitted for Preliminary PD back in 2020, there was a conditional rezoning agreement that conditionally rezoned the property to allow for the proposed project to take place. This restricted some of the uses and it narrowed down those types of R-6 and C-3 uses that could be allowed in this project

Schedule of Regulations and Modifications. The following modifications to Zoning Ordinance requirements are proposed on the PD plan includes:

- Lower Minimum side-to-side separation between residential buildings: 30 feet required; 20 feet proposed.
- Lower Minimum rear-to-rear separation between residential buildings: 80 feet required; 50 feet proposed.
- Lower Minimum side-to-rear separation between residential buildings: 60 feet required; 50 feet proposed.
- Sidewalks: There is a modification because there are attached garages. There is a requirement for an internal pedestrian path in lieu of sidewalks, and the applicant has chosen instead to have sidewalks along the street at the recommendation of Staff. So, the modification is to not have the internal pedestrian path system because there is a sidewalk system.
- Wetland Setbacks: To allow grading, utilities, and construction of residential buildings to be within the required setbacks as shown on the plan as well as the watercourse setback.
- Watercourse Setbacks: To allow grading within the required 75-foot setback from the Rouge River top of bank, and to allow grading and utilities within the required 25-foot setback from the top of bank of other watercourses.
- Landscape Buffer Between Commercial and Residential Zones: To install the required 30-foot

landscape buffer, but to locate it partially on the residential portion of the development instead of it being entirely on the commercial portion of the development. Given the mixed-used nature of the development as well as the configuration, Staff recommends approval of that modification

Architecture. For the residential units, the sheets show compliance with the requirements of the Ordinance that require 50% masonry on residential buildings, which includes stone and brick. The color images of the residential units are illustrative only and must be updated to include the required masonry at the time of site plan review. Some of the models don't have the required four-foot rear elevation offset as required by the Zoning Ordinance. In most cases it is fairly simple for residential units to include that four-foot rear elevation offset. In the case of the Redwood models, some of these are a little difficult given the proximity to the natural features behind them and the tight spacing between the rears of buildings that face rear-to-rear as well as buildings that face to a natural feature or a wetland. Therefore, Staff recommends that there be a modification to the four-foot rear elevation offset as stated in the plans. The same models were proposed at Preliminary PD. The four-foot offset was just something that wasn't brought up during the Preliminary PD.

Mr. Sloan stated that at its meeting on July 13, 2020, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Preliminary PD, subject to the addition of dormers, trim details, and garage door variety to add street interest in the architecture. Some of the models include these additional details, others do not. Sheet C100 shows the unit placement of the models, which is intended to reduce the monotony throughout the development by different model placements. Additionally, the Haydenwood model, which are the units with rears that face Morton-Taylor Rd. and the commercial areas, have improved rear elevations that include reverse gables, doors, porches, and railings to dress up those elevations.

The future commercial users are unknown at this time, so there are no architectural elevations for the commercial buildings. These will be required to comply with the architectural standards of the Zoning Ordinance at the time of site plan review. That includes masonry, and includes a review by the Planning Commission of the architectural features.

Parking: There is sufficient parking on the residential portion of the site for not only the residents of Redwood, but also visitors and there is some off-street common parking spaces as well.

The commercial parking is illustrated to meet the minimum parking standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Because the specific commercial land uses are unknown at this time, the parking ratios for the commercial uses will be determined at the time of site plan approval. But there is plenty of space in that commercial area to fit parking or surplus of parking.

Mr. Sloan stated Staff recently recommended to the applicant to consider removing the commercial parking row on the east side of the easternmost drive in the commercial area, as this could be heavily traveled and difficult to use as a parking aisle. This change would make the easternmost drive look similar to the westernmost drive. The applicant has replied that the parking will be adjusted as part of future submittals regarding the commercial development, and the applicant has included a sketch showing how compliance with this can be achieved.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation if the architectural elevations of the residential buildings are acceptable to the Planning Commission or have adequate conditions prior to Township Board action, Staff would recommend approval of the Final Planned Development District, as provided in the Planned Development Agreement and plan documents, including a modification to the 4-foot rear elevation offsets, subject to the applicant satisfying the requirements of Wayne County and MDOT, addressing any remaining requirements of the Township Attorney in the PD Agreement, removing the commercial parking row on

the east side of the easternmost drive in the commercial area, and adding outdoor seating around the pond near the commercial areas.

Commissioner Singh joined the Zoom Meeting.

Motion by Weber, supported by Okon, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously those present by roll call vote, 7-0 (7:50pm)

Mr. Sloan said it looks like there are a couple project representatives in the audience.

Mr. John Gaber stated he is the Attorney representing Marketplace, the commercial side of this project. Mr. Gaber stated Mr. Sloan had done a great job summarizing where they are now with the project. The only real issue on the commercial side that they had to deal with and accommodate was the access management standards. One thing that was not included in the packet of materials was a memorandum that their traffic engineer submitted last May to address this particular issue and explain why, with the reduction in the two curb cuts, that they can meet the driveway separation and the access management standards of MDOT. To reduce these curb cuts, they believe the three that are there are essential for a couple of reasons. The one on the far right and on the far left (east and west) also serve the residential community as well as the commercial community, and they are essential access points to the Redwood development as well. The second curb cut on the western side is necessary because it is adjacent to a portion of their parcel that is somewhat landlocked otherwise, and it makes sense to have the curb cut there. Also, it is right next to a residual parcel owned by a different property owner. That parcel is residential now but in the future that may change, and the developer would certainly entertain a cross-access shared driveway with that parcel, which would minimize additional curb cuts to Michigan Avenue. Mr. Gaber said they are here tonight to answer any questions. Kellie McIver is also here representing Redwood to answer any questions.

Mr. Sloan stated there are no other attendees with their hands raised in the audience.

Motion by Engel, supported by Okon, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously those present by roll call vote, 7-0 (7:54pm)

Commissioner Engel asked regarding 3650 Morton-Taylor, there is the existing Zone O-1. It is not part of the project but it is kind of surrounded by it. It says existing utilities are to be abandoned and existing structures to be removed. Is that part of this project?

Mr. Sloan said that it looked like the parcel is part of the project, but he will search.

Commissioner Engel asked to clarify that the project sponsors are going to be removing the structures and utilities.

Mr. Sloan stated the plans show them as being removed. One of those parcels is part of the development and it looks like the home itself is not part of the development. Mr. Sloan said he would defer to the applicant in terms of what the arrangement is for those removals.

Commissioner Engel said that part of 3650 Morton-Taylor is not part of the project then.

Mr. Sloan said that is correct. There are structures on 3650 Morton-Taylor, removal would have to be with the permission of the property owner.

Commissioner Weber said his biggest question is about stormwater. With all the wetlands around in the proximity of the river, and the drain etc., and given what we've experienced this summer with the rain,

what are the concerns about potential flooding here?

Mr. Sloan said that is definitely a concern. He does not know if the engineers have reviewed it in any great detail. They have a site plan on file, but they haven't been proceeding through the site plan process at the same rate as they have with the final PD process. There are a lot of wetlands around there, and there are a lot of stormwater ponds proposed too. The stormwater is under the jurisdiction of Wayne County and the Wayne County Stormwater Ordinance, so the applicants would have to design their stormwater system to perform to that ordinance standard. They will also have to fulfill the requirements of EGLE.

Commissioner Weber said he is not opposed to the project, but he just doesn't want a problem five-ten years from now with flooded residences. He hopes this is not contributing to a problem here.

Commissioner Engel asked if this property is in a flood zone, and will the homeowners be required to have flood insurance?

Mr. Sloan said he is not sure if it is in a flood zone, but there a couple project sponsors with their hands raised requesting to speak and could probably answer those questions.

Kellie McIver, Project Representative, stated most of the project is not in a flood zone. The only part is the drain running through the site. They do not build a building to touch the flood zone, as the flood insurance rate is extremely high. The residents can carry personal property insurance, but Redwood would carry the insurance on the buildings themselves. Ms. McIver stated storm is really important to them to manage property properly. They own their neighborhoods in perpetuity. They do not build and flip them; they stay and manage them, so it is really important that they have sound site development practices and they build in a way to protect their assets as well as those of their neighbors. Paul Furtaw is the Engineer and he worked really hard on this issue as well as every technical issue, and he can speak on some of the technical aspect of maintaining storm and the wetlands.

Mr. Paul Furtaw, Project Engineer, stated there are no buildings in the floodplain area. The only infrastructure that is inside that is the culvert crossing that they will be putting in. The top of the culvert will be above the floodplain. The County has not had an opportunity to look at these revised plans. The County did look at the previous set and they did conditionally approve it with a couple conditions. Mr. Furtaw said the stormwater infrastructure has been designed to accommodate the 100-year event and it has been designed per the County requirements.

Commissioner Engel asked to confirm Redwood will own all the units for renting, and not actually selling for home ownership.

Ms. McIver stated that is correct.

Commissioner Weber stated that residents could still come to the Township regarding flooding to complain that we didn't do our job, or the County didn't do their job in making sure the flood water was managed properly. He is just concerned, so may be being overly critical.

Mr. Sloan asked the applicants if the residential units will have basements.

Ms. McIver stated no, everything is built on slabs.

Commissioner Eggenberger had some questions regarding the schedule of regulations and the minimum rear-to-rear separation that should be 80 feet, they are going with 50 feet. Each one is shorter and tighter, what is the purpose for the regulation if we are just going to squeeze them all together anyway. Then

regarding the water, with the wetland setbacks and watercourse setbacks, it's looking like they are being allowed to do some sort of grading close to the wetlands.

Mr. Sloan stated that there is a requirement that there can't be any grading, utilities, or structures within 25 feet of a wetland boundary or watercourse top of bank. The only exception is that for the Rouge River, the requirement increases to 75 feet from the top of bank. The purpose is to protect the watercourse and to try to get any kind of development activity to take place outside of those setback areas. As a zoning requirement, those setbacks are treated like any other setback for a structure, whereas if a developer wanted relief from the requirement, they either have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals or come for a modification through the PD process. Mr. Sloan stated for the rear-to-rear setback reduced from 80 feet to 50 feet, he does see the concern there. The reason for the 80 feet is if someone is doing a project of attached residential buildings throughout a site, we would want those to be spaced out for light, for air, allowable landscaping, etc. What is unique about this project is that if they were to meet the 80 feet requirement, they would actually need to fill in more wetlands and expand the scope of their EGLE permit. Mr. Sloan stated that as they worked with the applicants to try to get the number of units that were approved at Preliminary PD, the separation distance from Staff's standpoint became less important than having sidewalks on both sides of the street and trying to preserve as many natural features as possible. As a result of that, the buildings got pushed closer together.

Mr. Sloan further explained this is a case-by-case basis. Many times during the development review process, we have prevented a lot of encroachments. A lot of times at the Planning Commission meetings and Board meetings we have been able to prevent encroachments and if necessary have tried to minimize those encroachments as well. Given the number of wetlands on this site and the way that the wetlands are laid out, they have tried to minimize the impacts within those wetland setback areas.

Commissioner Weber stated he is looking at the drawing within the Traffic Impact Study, and some of the units look like they are almost right on top of these wetlands. His experience is that these wetland setbacks are there for a reason and this seems like we are completely disregarding them.

Mr. Sloan displayed the Traffic Impact Study on screen. This was the study that was submitted at Preliminary PD review. The layout of the Preliminary PD is a little bit different than the layout presented this evening. The number of units is the same. In one of the areas where they were occupying a large footprint on the site, an area specifically just west of Morton-Taylor at the Preliminary PD review, this is a heavily wooded wetland area that they were proposing to fill in and have a road go through. This area off of Morton-Taylor Road at preliminary PD was approved for filling and clearing.

Commissioner Weber asked then if this drawing is the current one?

Mr. Sloan said that is the Preliminary PD that was previously approved. He displayed the Final PD plan on screen and explained the area where the applicants have decided not to build. As a result, they do have some wetland encroachments from the wetland that is preserved. So definitely there are wetland encroachments and a modification request, but a benefit in the sense that they are not proposing to develop and fill those areas as shown on the Preliminary PD plan.

Commissioner Engel asked if the red lines on the drawing is the 80 feet.

Mr. Sloan said the red line is the 25-foot setback from the wetland boundary. The 80 feet is a rear-to-rear setback.

Commissioner Engel asked for clarification that the 80 feet to 50 feet is reducing the area between the rear of the buildings. For the encroaching on the wetlands, a couple of buildings are technically inside the red

line. Is that what they are asking renumeration from?

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct. They are asking to be within that wetland setback area. They would not be within the wetland itself, they would just be within the setback from the boundary of the wetland.

Commissioner Weber asked if the petitioner would have to disclose to a potential tenant that those units are within a wetland setback area.

Ms. McIver stated that is not a disclosable condition. Being in a wetland setback area is not the same as being in a flood zone or even an area that has a propensity to flood. From a business perspective, it is not only about long-term asset management making sure that they are building things in a sustainable way, but also with the rents they charge and wanting residents to stay. They need to give them a place to stay that's safe. Ms. McIver stated the plan that Mr. Sloan presented before was the plan that was approved at preliminary review, so according to the code they could come in with that as long as the final plan substantially similar. After that, some of the Township's priorities changed to focus on what can be done with the wetlands and what can be done with connectivity. To be responsive to that, they increased the sidewalks to two sides of the road which results in some of the setbacks. And regarding the wetlands, they decreased wetlands that were to be impacted by removing by almost 3.5 acres to just over 1/2 an acre. So, they are in some setbacks, but what you see here is almost an 80% reduction in the number of wetlands impacted. Ms. McIver stated in response to the question of "why does the Township even have these rules if we are not going to look at them," the Canton code also provides for the PD arrangement which asks if the developer can do some innovative things with the development and address concerns like walkability, connectivity, and wetland preservation, and in exchange the Township could be a little flexible. That flexibility is built into the code.

Chairman Greene stated that the innovation is great until there's a disaster. There are five units that are definitely within these setbacks. Is there an issue with not having those five units?

Ms. McIver stated the other thing you are looking at there is not just those five homes, it's the connection point to the south. That road is also in the setback and it is required for access because there are over 100 homes on that side, so it requires two access points.

Commissioner Weber stated having a road in a setback is a lot different than having a residence.

Ms. McIver stated if they are going to build a road it is helpful to have the homes on it, particularly with the additional costs involved with doing the sidewalk on both sides of the road.

Commissioner Singh stated these properties do not have basements, they are built on slabs. Is there a study where there has been flood in this area, where water is coming in through the front door? Canton has had issues with basements being flooded, but not if the house is built on a slab.

Chairman Greene stated this is the first time we are having residential in this area, which could be a matter of the elevation and proximity to the watershed.

Commissioner Singh asked if there is any type of flood study in this area which tells if there have been any recent floods or any concerns.

Mr. Sloan stated he is not aware of any studies in this area.

Commissioner Weber asked how wet this area got this summer during the heavy rains.

Mr. Sloan said he does not know how wet that area got from those heavy rain events.

Commissioner Weber asked how far away is the river.

Mr. Sloan said that on the east side of Morton-Taylor Road north of the boundary is the Lower Rouge (map displayed on screen).

Commissioner Weber stated that the units up in that area also get dangerously close to the wetland setbacks then, is that what the red lines indicate?

Mr. Sloan stated those red lines are the 75-foot distance that is required from the top of bank of the Lower Rouge. For wetlands and other watercourses, the requirement is a 25-foot setback. The southernmost red line is the boundary of that 75-foot distance from the Rouge top of bank.

Commissioner Engel asked is the green area between the two red lines is the back yards.

Mr. Sloan stated the area between the red lines represents the 75-foot setback area.

Commissioner Engel said that the area is basically the back yards, it's just that it is a setback area. He assumes the grading would be downward away from the buildings.

Mr. Furtaw stated the elevations of the buildings are quite a bit higher than the top of bank.

Commissioner Okon asked if there are any clubhouses, and any parks in the development.

Ms. McIver said no they do not build clubhouses. The leasing office will have a pet wash station and then they have the sidewalk connections and then some benches placed along some of the various pond areas. There are some little pocket parks that will show up in the landscape plan around the detention pond and those sorts of areas.

Mr. Sloan displayed the landscape plan.

Commissioner Okon stated he is talking about a playground, that type of park.

Ms. McIver said no, they have nothing like that. The reason for that is most of the residents are empty nesters, the average age is 51. Most come from a three-mile radius of the neighborhood, so generally are already in the Life Fitness Center, the Club Pilates the Barre Yoga, those sorts of places. Whenever you build a clubhouse or an amenity like that, it gets built into the rent.

Commissioner Okon feels they are missing a big opportunity. With all the natural resources in the area, they are missing an opportunity to be able to showcase some of that.

Chairman Greene stated they could consider the fact that this is right near the trailhead, which is one of Canton's premier features recreationally. That should satisfy a lot of the recreational urges just based on where it's located, and the fact that they have preserved a lot more of the open area and natural features than was required by ordinance.

Commissioner Acharya had some concerns about the project. He does not know if the PDD demonstrates the benefits to the community. He thinks the entire project is too tight, trying to do too much. There are too many residentials clumped together, the encroachment of wetlands, and the rear-to-rear separation being reduced. And given the situation with flooding, the stormwater infrastructure is going to be under a lot of stress. Commissioner Acharya said that given the scale of the project, he really is concerned and apprehensive.

Chairman Greene had several concerns. The water issue being one. He does not want Canton to be that place in the news that had massive flooding in a residential area. However, he feels like the developers and project sponsors have done their homework in terms of elevations and grading and what they could do in these areas. Also, that they will have sufficient insurance in order to mitigate the damages that may come in these areas. Chairman Greene said he is a little apprehensive of the fact that they are not willing to sacrifice 5 of 235 units in order to get out of the immediate wetland setback situation. However, knowing that you are going to have flooding, it's probably not going to stop at that red line anyway if it happened at all. Chairman Greene is also concerned with traffic flow on the property. From looking at the ingress and egress of the residential area on the west side going around the commercial area there is the drive coming in off of Michigan Avenue, but on the east side residential, they proposed a temporary cul-de-sac. Why is that not connected to the other end of the commercial area with that drive down to Michigan Avenue?

Ms. McIver responded there are over 100 homes on the eastern side of the neighborhood as well as the western side, so per fire code they need to have two points of access. Since they are developing Morton-Taylor up to the north with sidewalks running all the way up to the north with Phase II, those two access points off of Morton-Taylor will give the required access. They will not be adding the curb cut to Michigan Avenue with the residential portion. That will be something Marketplace does once it has a user for that commercial side. So that temporary turnaround is just to provide a place where fire can turn around until that connection is made when Marketplace has a user.

Chairman Greene asked why they wouldn't connect it immediately in the original design.

Ms. McIver answered that they already had two points of access off of Morton-Taylor. It wasn't a concern that was brought up at preliminary. Those two access points are historically part of the approved preliminary plan, so it wasn't changed for final. They can take a look at it.

Chairman Greene said another concern he has is Morton-Taylor itself. Per the drawing, Morton-Taylor is going to be widened by 10 feet, is that correct? The right-of-way will be 10 feet wider.

Mr. Sloan stated the existing right-of-way is 33 feet and there is an 86-foot right-of-way proposed.

Chairman Greene said that the two immediate accesses off of Morton-Taylor, it seems that ultimately there could be quite a bottleneck there with the two driveways.

Ms. McIver stated their traffic is not going to be substantial enough to cause a backup at that Morton-Taylor/Michigan Ave. intersection. The real traffic impacts will happen once the commercial users are fully in there.

Chairman Greene stated this is kind of unique to the Commission. Usually there is residential building around residential. But this is commercial building around residential, which messes with the flow. Is there a contingency plan should that situation change in the future in terms of just having it all be commercial?

John Gaber stated he is not sure he follows the reasoning of the question.

Chairman Greene said that as it's proposed right now, they would be building commercial around a residential off of Michigan Avenue. But people change and circumstances change, so he is assuming there is a contingency commercial plan designed in case that property ever changes over or if the developer could purchase it to make the flow of the commercial smoother.

Mr. Gaber stated yes, that would be their preference and they have had discussions with that property owner. But the asking price is just untenable to be able to do that. But they would contemplate that particular site to convert to commercial in the future whether it becomes part of our development or it doesn't. That is one of the reasons they proposed the drive there to be a shared access, to facilitate the future commercial development of that particular site.

Chairman Greene asked about the elevations and streetscape. With units like this, you can't avoid the fact that garage prominence is key. Chairman Greene knows they will vary the building materials and do a lot of other things to create variety, but there will still be average garage doors. Is there any thought to having a variety of different garage door designs—windows, windowless, things of that nature that are going to distinguish one unit from another.

Ms. McIver stated they could certainly do window versus windowless garages.

Chairman Greene said he would urge that. Just looking down the street and seeing garage doors is not really an attractive view, but it's not something that can be helped in a design like this. Also, when looking at the site plan at each building unit, he sees four boxes on the street side of each unit. Is that drawn that way to indicate parking spaces or the garages themselves?

Ms. McIver explained those are the two-car garages and then the driveways after that.

Mr. Furtaw said they can take those off.

Chairman Greene stated that, having been on the Planning Commission when it was decided to make Michigan Avenue more multi-opportunity, particularly on the north side of Michigan Avenue where there was primarily light industrial and a little bit of commercial. Now we have in addition to the industrial, we have commercial and now residential, and this is the first residential that the Commission has approved on Michigan Avenue. Chairman Greene said this is very key to Canton, and believes it is going to be a very prominent piece of Canton if approved. Michigan Avenue is starting to be recognized by a lot of different businesses and will continue to grow.

Chairman Greene asked if there is a reason these units are not attractive to younger users, like young professional types.

Ms. McIver said she wouldn't say they are not attractive to younger users, but they are very attractive to empty nesters. The reason for that is the single-story living, ADA compliant on the interior. The other 30% of their residents are actually young professionals. Rents here will start out an average of \$2,100 a month, so when drawing in that young professional as well as provide a place for empty nesters in Canton, there are going to be people with some buying power, and they are happy to provide a little bit of density and that buying power to this part of Michigan Avenue.

Commissioner Weber asked what is the time expectation for the commercial to get built out.

Mr. Gaber stated there is a timeline for 5-6 years to build out the PD. That is in the PD agreement. The difficulty they encounter is: 1) It is difficult to take a site like this and try to market the commercial first, because you don't have the residential density behind you which creates a customer base for the small-mid commercial being talked about; 2) You won't get any traction on the marketing of this site until somebody sees a shovel going into the ground, and that's going to be on the residential side first. Once they see this is actually a project, that will generate a lot of interest at that time and the project will move forward.

Commissioner Eggenberger referred back to the traffic study. It looks as though there needs to be a signal added. Is that going to be done through MDOT? It's remarked on Phase 2 of the development, it says "adding a signal at this intersection along with some geometric improvements in a long overdue need that requires immediate attention".

Mr. Furtaw stated that is something the Township might want to be concerned with. When looking at that study, that's the background condition where that the existing scenario is a failing scenario and a signal is warranted at that intersection (Sheldon & Geddes) to help improve those. But that is the background condition. The additional traffic generated by this development doesn't make it any less of a failure. The recommendations are a right-turn lane improvement to the intersection in that crossover. That will help mitigate the additional traffic generated by this development. Mr. Furtaw said there are some concerns with traffic in this area generally.

Commissioner Eggenberger said then that it might not make it fail more, but it certainly isn't going to help.

Mr. Gaber said the elimination of the two curb cuts will help too because there will be fewer points to conflict. The traffic study was done before those two curb cuts were eliminated.

Commissioner Engel asked, with the improvements on this site and where they are going to put the water, won't that be an improvement on the property. The water on the site will be managed better once the site is developed than it is being managed now.

Mr. Furtaw said that is the intent.

Mr. Weber asked before a shovel is put in the ground, a permit is issued and they have to go through the County and EGLE, correct?

Mr. Sloan said that is correct. Additionally, if Final PD is approved they will have to come back to the Planning Commission for Site Plan review.

Mr. Weber asked if the Commission or the Township Board will see this again after EGLE or the County has approved the handling of the water.

Mr. Sloan said unless it's a site condo, we typically don't have the full EGLE permits and County stormwater permit before site plan approval, but should they proceed with site plan review, they'll have enough engineering on their plan from a preliminary standpoint for feasibility to have our engineers look at it. Mr. Sloan further explained the process.

Mr. Weber asked if one of the conditions of the motion include getting the appropriate permits from Wayne County and EGLE.

Commissioner Engel said the model resolution says “satisfying the requirements of Wayne County and MDOT”. We could add EGLE in there.

Motion by Engel, supported by Weber, to move to recommend final approval of the Redwood Marketplace Canton Planned Development District on tax parcel nos. : 103-99-0001-003, 133-99-0001-001, 133-99-0001-002, 133-99-0001-003, 133-99-0002-000 (3700 Morton Taylor), 133-99-0004-000 (43600 Michigan Ave.), 133-99-0006-000, 133-99-0007-000, 133-99-0008-000 (43780 Michigan Ave.), 133-99-0009-000 (43800 Michigan Ave.), and 138-99-0004-000, as provided in the Planned Development Agreement and plan documents, including a modification to the 4-foot rear elevation offset requirement for the Meadowood-Forestwood models, subject to applicant satisfying the requirements of Wayne County, MDOT, and EGLE, addressing any remaining requirements of the Township Attorney in the PD Agreement, removing the commercial parking row on the east side of the easternmost drive in the commercial area, and adding outdoor seating around the pond near the commercial areas.

Commissioner Okon called the vote:

Ayes: Engel, Eggenberger, Weber, Singh, Okon, and Greene

Nays: Acharya

Motion passed by those present by roll call vote, 6-1. (7:33pm)

Chairman Greene stated there are some things that have to happen before this comes back to the Commission for site plan. The PDD still has to go to the Township Board. Mr. Sloan stated that is correct.

NEW BUSINESS-SITE PLANS

3. 062-SPC-6890 **MONARK GROVE** – Consider Site Plan on parcel nos. 062-99-0004-000 (46475 Ford Rd.), 062-99-0005-000, 036-01-0003-003 (46311 Ford Rd.), 036-01-0003-005, 036-01-0003-006 (46109 Ford Rd.), 036-01-0004-001 (2057 Gorman Rd.), 036-01-0004-002, and 036-01-0005-000 (1941 Gorman Rd.) for a Housing for the Elderly use. Property is located on the south side of Ford Road between Beck Rd. and Canton Center Rd.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant proposes to construct a housing for the elderly use at the southwest corner of Ford Rd. and Gorman Rd., located between Beck Rd. and Canton Center Rd. The proposed housing for the elderly use consists of 225 units on 17.25 acres, which proposed a mix of independent living, assisted living, memory care, and some attached elderly cottages.

The Township Board of Trustees approved the Final Planned Development (PD) District on August 24, 2021. Prior to the Township Board approval, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended approval of the Final PD at its August 2, 2021 meeting. The applicant now comes before the Planning Commission for site plan review, which is the next step in the process.

This project is a Planned Development and its definite benefits included the following:

- Architectural design of the buildings, which include 50% masonry
- Paving of Gorman Road to the site’s entrance, including reconstruction of the approach to 3 lanes, with dedicated right- and left-turn lanes from Gorman Rd. onto Ford Rd.
- Extending the sidewalk along the south side of Ford Rd. eastward about 620 feet to connect to the existing sidewalk in front of Belle Tire

- Adding northbound and southbound right turn lights at the intersection of Canton Center Rd. and Ford Rd. to permit overlap phases for northbound and southbound right turns
- Maintaining over 25% of the site as open space
- Including outdoor recreation areas for residents of the development that will include pickleball and bocce ball.

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access: There is pedestrian access throughout the site, and there are sidewalks throughout the site. With that sidewalk on the south side of Ford Road, somebody could walk from Monark Grove to The Kroger or shopping center there where there are existing sidewalks to tie into.

Architecture: At Final PD review, there was a proposal for less than 50% brick and a couple options were presented. The Planning Commission opted for the option with at least 50% brick and the Board agreed with that. So, part of the approved Planned Development is to have at least 50% brick, and the elevation plans submitted reflect that for the main building, and also for the cottages.

Landscaping and Nature Features: Mr. Sloan said Planning Staff had several landscaping comments, mostly citing the applicable landscape standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff has been in the process of verifying counts, and sometimes that process is ongoing especially as things get modified throughout the engineering design process. Basically, they are in agreement in terms of the applicable standards, and the landscape designs and the plans submitted are very close to the standards.

The applicable landscape requirements are: Frontage landscaping, Parking lot landscaping, Building foundation landscaping, Detention pond landscaping, and General site landscaping.

There is a requirement in the Ordinance that housing for the elderly uses must meet the multi-family district standards. This can be a very difficult standard to attain because a lot of times housing for the elderly is not laid out like a multi-family development. Multi-family development requires trees and shrubs on a per-unit basis, which for a multi-family space there is space to work with that. Sometimes on a housing for the elderly site, there is not always the space. So rather than landscape the site on a per-unit basis, Staff recommends landscaping based on having the standard for building foundation landscaping and also general site landscaping. This combination standard has been used on some other housing for the elderly uses in Canton, so this would be consistent in using the foundation and the general site landscaping in lieu of the multi-family standard. Mr. Sloan stated Staff would recommend a motion to modify those standards accordingly. The multi-family standards would apply to the frontage landscaping, which would be alongside both Ford Road and Gorman Road. There would be parking lot landscaping just like any other parking lot in a similar facility. The foundation landscaping and general landscaping would allow for landscaping not just adjacent to the buildings, but also the general side landscaping throughout the entire site

Because the detention ponds will be heavily visible, there will be trees required around the ponds to dress them up.

Parking: The proposed parking lots include 43 more spaces than the minimum number of spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance. However, 40 of the proposed spaces are labeled as “landbank parking”. At the previous PD reviews Staff recommended that the PD Agreement and site plan states that those landbank parking spaces will not be permitted without the explicit approval from the Planning Commission at site plan approval.

The cottage buildings include an attached 2-car garage for each unit, and additional parking is allowed

in the driveways. There is a 30-foot wide internal road that is wide enough to allow on-street parking wherever permitted.

Lighting: Staff recommends lowering some of the fixtures and having some different places, but that's something that they will continue to work with the applicants on. In Section 2.13 of the Zoning Ordinance, the major standard they have to meet is that there is the maximum illumination of the lot lines. The site is designed to meet those elimination standards so that it won't impact the adjacent neighbors.

Dumpster Enclosure. The dumpster enclosure is designed to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Signage. Although it is administratively approved by the Building Division, Planning Staff has one minor change not on the sign itself, but where the masonry base has to be slightly increased.

Mr. Sloan stated that the site plan is consistent with the Final PD plan and Staff's recommendation is approval, subject to the requirements of the Final Planned Development District approval and all state, county, and municipal requirements, including the necessary revisions noted in this report for landscaping, lighting, and signage and that the permitting and construction of the off-site sidewalk along Ford Road be done to the satisfaction of the MDOT and the Canton Township Engineering Services Division.

David Endres from Kirco Development stated he has several of their consultants on the line, Scott Deisler with PH7 Architects (architect for the project), Paul Lewsley with Environmental Engineers (civil engineer), Pat Conroy with Conroy Associates (Landscape architect), Mike Labadie with Rowe Engineering (traffic engineer), and Chip Heine with Kirco Development. Mr. Endres stated their main objective is to be an amenity to the Canton area in terms of senior living. It's an area that their studies show as lacking significantly in the area. From a thematic perspective, they want this project to be resort-like and park-like. They have planned the landscape layout to reflect those central design considerations. Their objective is to start this project early next year and get it rolling, pending these final approvals.

There were no comments from the Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Greene stated he feels this project will be great for Canton. As a part of this project, they are going to include sidewalks on both sides Gorman up to the property line, and then also plan to extend the sidewalk along Ford Road on the south side up to where the Belle Tire sidewalk is. So, thinking in terms of the worst conditions, who will take care of the snow on the sidewalk on the south side of Ford Road, and also on the east side of Gorman?

Mr. Sloan stated that if there is a sidewalk adjacent to the property, then that adjacent property owner along the frontage would be responsible for that sidewalk.

Chairman Greene said this is creating an obligation on the east side of Gorman to those property owners there, which have not developed yet, to take care of those sidewalks.

Mr. Sloan said that by the ordinance, they would. If there was a sidewalk repair, the Township has a sidewalk repair program throughout the township, and it's generally the adjacent property owner who is responsible for that sidewalk, especially in a public road right-of-way. The sidewalks are in the public road right-of-way, so if someone lives on a public road and don't have a sidewalk in front of their house, the County, Township, or State could come and build the sidewalk in front of their house within the public right-of-way. It does create an amenity but also an obligation from the adjacent property owner.

Chairman Greene asked who is going to shovel that snow. The property owner does not have anything there.

Mr. Sloan said he would defer to the Township Ordinance that requires that the sidewalks be maintained by the adjacent owner.

Chairman Greene is happy that the sidewalk will be put in, but also fearful because they are dealing with both the elderly who are moving around to do what they need to do, but also dealing with some memory care issues which could be a safety issue along Ford Road. He is also considering the safety issue in terms of maintenance of the pathway itself with the Michigan winters.

Commissioner Weber asked why do they have to put the sidewalk in on the eastern side. Why couldn't that be the responsibility of whomever develops those properties on the eastern side of Gorman?

Mr. Sloan stated it was proposed on the plans, partly because they are going to be paving this part of Gorman Road from Ford south to just south of their proposed driveway. Sometimes when there is a major right-of-way improvement, that is the time when sidewalks are installed on both sides.

Chairman Greene stated he likes the elevations, and he likes the way it looks in terms of the drawings he sees here. This should be a beautiful project.

Motion by Engel, supported by Weber, to move to recommend approval of the Monark Grove site plan on tax parcel nos.: 062-99-0004-000, 062-99-0005-000, 036-01-0003-003, 036-01-0003-005, 036-01-0003-006, 036-01-0004-001, 036-01-0004-002, and 036-01-0005-000, subject to the requirements of the Final Planned Development District approval and all state, county, and municipal requirements, including the necessary revisions noted in this report for landscaping, lighting, and signage and that the permitting and construction of the off-site sidewalk along Ford Road be done to the satisfaction of the MDOT and the Canton Township Engineering Services Division.

Commissioner Okon called the vote:

Ayes: Engel, Eggenberger, Weber, Singh, Acharya, Okon, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0. (9:12 pm)

Mr. Sloan said the next step is for the site plan to go to the Township Board for final action. This will not come back to the Planning Commission unless there was a site plan amendment that rose to the level of a Planning Commission review.

4. 040-DIR-6931 **BJ'S WHOLESALE CLUB** – Consider Developer Instigated Revision to Site Plan on parcel no. 040-99-0006-709 (43690 Ford Rd.) for BJ's Wholesale Club. Property is located north of Ford Road, between Morton Taylor Road and Sheldon Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant, BJ's Wholesale Club, is proposing a retail superstore to re-occupy the vacated JC Penney building on the north side of Ford Rd. The site consists of a 104,718-sq. ft. building, a 415-space parking lot, and an access drive directly from Morton Taylor Road as well as several cross-access points to adjacent sites. The site is part of the Ford Sheldon-Newman PDD, which was originally approved in 2004 for the site, and the JC Penney site plan was approved in 2007 pursuant to that PDD agreement.

The current PDD Agreement does allow for retail superstores.

At its meeting on October 12, 2021, the Township Board of Trustees approved a PDD amendment that included the following terms. These were terms that were also recommended for approval by the Planning Commission previously:

1. An automobile tire center is proposed as an ancillary use to the retail superstore. The services provided in the tire center are limited to the rotation, balancing, repair, inflation check, and road-hazard warranty work only on tires purchased at BJ's, and not available for tires not purchased at BJ's. All services will be conducted indoors and not in the parking lot or other outside areas. The bay doors of the automobile tire center may be opened only during the ingress and egress of a vehicle being serviced, and the garage doors shall remain closed while tire center services are being performed. This was a condition of the Planning Commission's recommendation of approval of the PDD, and also approved by the Board.
2. The on-site trash compactor shall not be operated between 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. This was another condition by the Planning commission that came out of concerns from some of the neighbors.
3. The minimum number of parking spaces is reduced from 415 to 399. These spaces will now be occupied by cart corrals and the tire center bay front door entrances.

The layout of the site is mostly the same as what was shown on the PDD plan, so there is nothing major that has changed on the site.

Architecture. The only significant items are the architecture of the building. At the September 13th Planning Commission meeting the applicant had proposed to infill the middle area of the building, which is currently a glass door entrance (the major entrance to JC Penney). The applicants proposed to fill that in with brick to match the existing brick and then having entrances on both sides of that. So, BJ's will have two main entrances. After Staff reviewed those proposals and looked at some other options, instead of bricking in that middle the applicant has proposed to put in spandrel glass so it will be vertically consistent with the rest of the building. That will be the only major change for the architecture. On the west side of the building, the only significant change is to add three (3) glass bay doors for the tire service center.

Access Management. The original PD Agreement restricts the delivery hours from 6:30 am to 10:00 pm, and those terms will remain in effect. The access drive on the south side of the store to Morton-Taylor Road is partially contained on the subject parcel. It has many potholes and is poorly maintained. The applicant has noted on Sheet 1 of the site plan stating "Existing service drive to be repaired as needed to restore to original condition as required by Township of Canton." Also, pursuant to the condition of PDD approval, Staff recommends that the design and condition of the access drive be addressed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Services Division during its upcoming review.

Legal Description. This parcel has a peninsula that goes out to Morton-Taylor Road. On the plan it shows the old JC Penney parcel area. After JC Penny was approved, it was a land division that was subsequently approved that added that peninsula out to Morton-Taylor. That area is reflected on the site plan according to the legal description. There are some minor discrepancies between the recorded legal description the lot line labels on the survey, and the applicant is in the process of obtaining a survey to reconcile these discrepancies. Staff does not see any of these discrepancies as impactful to the compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Dumpster Enclosure and Grease Trap. The trash compactor will remain in the enclosure in the northwest corner of the building. An underground grease trap is proposed on the north side of the building.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation is approval of the site plan for BJ's Wholesale Club on said

parcel, subject to the design and condition of the access drive being addressed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Services Division and that the parcel survey be updated on the site plan.

Mr. Bryan Amann (representing for the applicant) stated he and the applicant are in complete agreement on the two things Mr. Sloan mentioned about the access drive. The survey on the legal description was finalized today. They appreciate the time invested in this project by Mr. Sloan and the administration and will be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Weber asked about the access drive. When Engineering looks at the design and condition of that access drive, he hopes that means they will be looking at ways to improve upon it, not just restore it to its original condition.

Mr. Sloan said that's why they included the condition with Engineering Services. The existing condition may be fine, but that's why he wants the Engineering Services Division to look at it. Mr. Sloan does not want it to be restored to something that may end up with the same problem in the future.

Commissioner Weber stated that with this new use, there will be a lot more truck traffic and more traffic in general. He hopes the plan would be to improve it and make it a better construction in general.

Mr. Amann responded that they do not disagree with that. Something was missed on the original design as it related to the handling of water, which was gathering and not properly draining. Mr. Amann said as they get into the redesign with the engineers, they plan to get this fixed in a way that will be sustainable and with better drainage.

There were no other comments from the commissioners.

Chairman Greene stated the only concern he has is with the 10:00 pm late time for trash compactors. He knows this is a done deal with this project, but is that time a standard in Canton in terms of compactors?

Mr. Sloan said the Township has a general noise ordinance that would probably discourage operating a trash compactor near a residential area after a certain hour. He did not know what hour the decibel level goes down, but he believes around 10:00 pm. This standard is in the Zoning Ordinance and would be enforced by the Ordinance Enforcement Division.

Chairman Greene said he is asking because trash compactors are very big and loud. If you live adjacent to these, at 10:00 at night, you are going to be annoyed. Could that be looked at in the Zoning Ordinance to perhaps modify that down to, say, 8:00 pm in the future?

Chairman Greene stated he likes the project and is glad to see that vacant building being occupied by a successful business.

Commissioner Weber asked what is the timeline for this project.

Mr. Amann said they are looking to start this as soon as possible. The owner of the land is eager to start receiving rent in there. Mr. Amann expects to see the work start in early spring and hopefully be open by May or June, depending on equipment delivery, etc.

Motion by Weber, supported by Acharya, to move to approve the site plan for BJ's Wholesale Club on parcel no. 71-040-99-0006-709 at 43690 Ford Rd., subject to the design and condition of the

access drive being addressed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Services Division and that the parcel survey be updated on the site plan.

Commissioner Okon called the vote:

Ayes: Engel, Eggenberger, Weber, Singh, Acharya, Okon, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0. (9:27pm)

NEW BUSINESS-STAFF REFERRAL (NEW PLANS RECEIVED TO REFER FOR STAFF REVIEW)

5. 132-DIR-6993 **MOTOR CITY ELECTRIC** – Consider Site Plan on parcel nos. 132-01-0027-000, 132-01-0035-000, 132-01-0036-000, 132-01-0037-000, 132-01-0038-000, 132-01-0039-000, 132-01-0040-000, 132-01-0041-000, and 132-01-0042-000 at 5390 Belleville Road. Property is located west of Belleville Road, between Michigan Avenue and Van Born Road.

Motion by Weber, supported by Eggenberger, to refer Item #5 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS-SET PUBLIC HEARING

None.

MISCELLANEOUS – DISCUSSION

Commissioner Weber asked about the new senior development that was just completed on Ford Road by Crimboli's. It looks nice, but there is a big back-up generator sitting out in front, blocking two windows. Was there a reason why they put it there? Could they have put it somewhere a little more aesthetically pleasing?

Mr. Sloan said Staff has heard about that, and he will have to go back to the plans. The plans are a few years old so they predate his time at the Township. The plans did show the electric from the road connecting to the front of the site. Typically, you would see a generator on the side or back of the building. Mr. Sloan said they are going to try to work with the applicant to try to get as good a screening as possible to soften the appearance and try to conceal it.

Mr. Weber asked if those windows are to a residential unit or an office.

Mr. Sloan said those may be unit windows.

Chairman Greene asked if that is something that came out after it was approved, should the Commission have caught this?

Mr. Sloan said sometimes it is very subtle the way the electrical is put there. He thinks they had a transformer on the east side of the entrance on the electrical plans. Staff has looked at this in reviewing other plans and going through a checklist that they have developed to try to find these things at site plan review.

Chairman Greene noted that the project on Michigan Avenue (Amazon) has been moving dirt like crazy there.

Mr. Sloan stated there is a lot of activity in that area. Filmore Place is just northeast of that so there is quite a bit of development activity happening in that area currently.

ADJOURN

Motion by Weber, supported by Engel, to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:33pm.

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary